

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,926	09/22/2003	Jie-Wei Chen	03-494	1618
•	7590 04/02/2007 LAPOINTE, P.C.		EXAMINER	
900 CHAPEL STREET			HEINRICH, SAMUEL M	
SUITE 1201 NEW HAVEN, CT 06510			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
- ; - · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			1725	
SHORTENED STATUTORY	PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MON	NTHS	04/02/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

			. 1-		
		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
		10/667,926	CHEN ET AL.		
Office Action S	Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	•	Samuel M. Heinrich	1725		
The MAILING DATE of Period for Reply	of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, - Extensions of time may be available after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mail - If NO period for reply is specified abo - Failure to reply within the set or exte	FROM THE MAILING DA under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 ing date of this communication. ove, the maximum statutory period we nded period for reply will, by statute, or than three months after the mailing	IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE date of this communication, even if timely filed	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status		·			
	2b)☐ This is in condition for allowar	nnuary 2007. action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro fx parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	· ·		
Disposition of Claims					
5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are 6) ☑ Claim(s) 17,20,22 and 7) ☑ Claim(s) 19,21,23,24 8) ☐ Claim(s) are si Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is ob 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed of Applicant may not reque Replacement drawing s	is/are withdrawallowed. d 25-31 is/are rejected. and 32 is/are objected to abject to restriction and/or objected to by the Examine in 14 November 2005 is/a lest that any objection to the sheet(s) including the correct	vn from consideration. . r election requirement.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). sected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTC 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent I 3) Information Disclosure Statemen Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte		

Application/Control Number: 10/667,926

Art Unit: 1725

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 17, 20, 22, and 25-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of USPN 5,272,307 to Jones in view of USPN 5,906,364 to Thompson et al and in view of USPN 5,884,906 to Morse. AAPA describes (Specification, Background of the Invention) well known laser machining such as transmission welding. Jones describes (Front Page Figure and Abstract) clamping of multiple lead connections and transmission bonding through hold down plate 12. Thompson et al describe (Abstract) evenly supporting a workpiece and describe (paragraph beginning column 1, line 63) use of multiple adjustable support

Application/Control Number: 10/667,926

Art Unit: 1725

pins. Morse discloses a workpiece support comprising multiple jaws which can accommodate multiple and various workpieces. The use of plural adjustable supports and a transparent clamp element would have been obvious at the time applicant's invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art because the transparent clamp is very well known and because both multiple workpieces and adjustable supports are well known in work holding arts. The use of transparent tape strips are known in the laser bonding art and the use of a transparent tape with a transparent clamp would have been obvious at the time applicant's invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art because the tape provides flexible workpiece support. Preloaded workpiece carriers are well known and substituting an unworked carrier for a worked carrier would have been obvious at the time applicant's invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art because it speeds processing. Correspondingly shaped air openings in plural plates would have been obvious in order to provide repeatable assembly of subsequent plates.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 19, 21, 23, 24, and 32 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant states the examiner relied on the specification as prior art in the last rejection. Examiner notes that the three secondary references used in the rejection under 35 USC 103 were drawn to laser processing of clamped workpieces. Applicant's

further arguments with respect to the amended claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samuel M. Heinrich whose telephone number is 571-272-1175. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, P. Ryan can be reached on 571-272-1292. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1725

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Samuel M Heinrich Primary Examiner Art Unit 1725

SMH